



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,829	09/30/2003	Stephen Burns	021756-003300US	3773
51206 7590 11/24/2009 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP/ORACLE TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
BASEHOAR, ADAM L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,829

Applicant(s)

BURNS ET AL.

Examiner

ADAM L. BASEHOAR

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 07/27/09.
2. All previous rejections the claims are maintained in view of the Amendment.
3. Claims 1-29 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 23, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-19 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al (US-6,327,628 12/04/01) in view of Bales et al (US-2004/0010598 01/15/04).

-In regard to substantially similar independent claims 1, 11, and 23, Anuff teaches a computer system method for generating a page/graphical user interface, the method comprising:

forwarding information, from a first computer system (column 1, lines 59-67: "portal server"; column 3, lines 40-57) to a second computer system (column 4, lines 15-33: "client interface")(Fig. 3: "Client"), that configures the second computer system to display one or more graphical user interfaces that enable users of the second computer system to interactively defining content and layout of portlets configured to generate information displays when included on the portal page (Figs. 2, 4, 10);

forwarding information, from the first computer system to the second computer system, that configures the second computer system to display a first user interface in the one or more graphical user interfaces based on selections by the users of the second computer system of data types for data sources associated with portlets being designed by users (e.g. Figs. 2 & 10), the first user interface configured to receive access information declaratively specified by the users of the second computer system during an interactive session with one or more graphical user interfaces of the data sources associated with the portlet being designed by the users (column 2, lines 1-12; column 3, lines 44-67; column 4, lines 1-14: “user can edit the content of the individual modules”; column 7, lines 5-24 & 59-63; column 8, lines 38-51; column 10, lines 52-67; column 13, lines 22-67: “portal server session...user’s front page is displayed via the browser application”; column 14, lines 15-26) with the first user interface to create software coding for generating portlets (i.e. modules)(column 4, lines 46-67: “software objects”; column 6, lines 34-46; column 7, lines 5-24; column 14, lines 1-9: “module view object contains display logic for its module...generates the HTML for its front-page view”; column 3, lines 58-67; column 10, lines 52-62; column 13, lines 53-67)(Fig. 4);

forwarding information from the first computer system to the second computer system, that configures the second computer system to display a second user interface, the second user interface configured to receive layout information declaratively specified by the user during the interactive sessions, the layout information indicative of a visualization of at least one layout style from one or more layout styles presented by the second user interface for data from the data sources associated with the portlets being designed by the users (column 2, lines 3-12; column 3, lines 40-56: “enable the user to revise the layout of the portal, change its color scheme”; column

4, lines 6-15: “user can determine which modules appear in each of the groups, as well as their order of appearance”; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-64; column 13, lines 53-67; column 14, lines 1-30; column 15, lines 6-45)(Fig. 5a & 5b);

determining a data source specification based on the access information associated with the first data source of a first data type selected by a first user of the second computer system, the access information received via the first user interface from a user during an interactive session with the first user interface (column 3, lines 61-67; column 4, lines 1-5; column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 21-67);

determining a layout specification based on a first layout information received from a user during an interactive session with the second user interface (column 2, lines 3-12; column 4, lines 6-14; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-64; column 13, lines 53-67; column 14, lines 1-30)(Fig. 5a & 5b);

generating software coding that represents an object that represents a portlet/GUI (i.e. module) based on the data source specification and the layout specification (column 7, lines 5-24; column 13, lines 53-65: “each module generates HTML...designated by the layout”; column 14, lines 3-9: “module view object contains display logic for its module...generates the HTML for its front-page view”), the portlet configured by the software coding to create a visual representation within the portal page of data (column 13, lines 55-59)(Fig. 2) specified by the data source specification according to the visualization indicated by the layout specification (column 2, lines 1-12; column 3, lines 40-56; column 4, lines 6-15; column 7, lines 5-25; column 13, lines 55-67; column 14, lines 1-30)(Figs. 2 and 10-12);

retrieving data for the data source based on the data source specification and the access information (column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 52-67); determining a layout for the data within the portlet based on the layout specification (column 2, lines 3-12; column 4, lines 6-14; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-64)(Fig. 5a & 5b); and generating the page using the portlet (column 2, lines 1-20; column 3, lines 44-65: "HTML web page")(Fig. 2).

While Anuff teaches displaying user interfaces for defining the content and layout of portlets and portals, Anuff does not specifically teach the generating of a set of graphical user interfaces by the computer system that enable user to construct software code that generates portlets to be generated/included on a portlet page. Bales teaches automatically generating a set of graphical user interfaces by a computer system that enable users to automatically construct software code that generates portlets to be generated/included on a portlet page (Paragraphs 33-34: "portlet components...portlet layout elements...wizard...automatically generate portlets", 35-36: "automates the creation of a portal"; and 39-61: "Portlet Generation...automatically generating code for implementing a portlet"(Figs. 4A-Fig. 10). Bales further teaches wherein a server computer system forwards the interactive user interfaces to a client computer system wherein a user can interactively define portlet features (e.g. "Portlet Name", "Portlet Components"; "Content Types"; "Resource Files"; "Portal Templates", etc) through a plurality of user interfaces during interactive sessions (Figs. 4A-Fig. 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for portal/portlet system of Anuff to have included the set of generated user interfaces of Bales, because Bales taught that a wizard based user interface method for automatically generating portlets and portals provided the user a quicker and less cumbersome process for creating said portlets and portals (Paragraph 8:

"cumbersome...time and effort"; Paragraph 35: "automates the creation of a portlet and reduces the number of steps otherwise needed for portlet creation"; Paragraph 36: "automates the creation of a portal and reduces the number of steps otherwise needed for portal creation").

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 12, and 24, Anuff teaches wherein the data source specification comprises determining the data type of the first data source (column 3, lines 61-67; column 4, lines 1-5; column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 52-67).

-In regard to dependent claims 3 and 13, Anuff teaches wherein the data type of the first data source comprises at least one of a spreadsheet data type, XML data type, SQL data type, web service data type, and a web page data type (column 3, lines 61-67; column 4, lines 1-5; column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 52-67).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 14, and 25, Anuff teaches wherein the access information comprises determining a path to the data source (column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-5; column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 52-62; column 13, lines 53-67; column 14, lines 1-9).

-In regard to dependent claims 6, 16, and 27, Anuff teaches wherein the data source specification comprises determining a filtering specification based on filter information received from the first user during the first interactive session via a third graphical user interface in the one or more GUIs, the third GUI configured to receive data filters specified by the users of the

second computer system that filter data retrieved from the data source for the portlets being designed by the users (column 7, lines 20-22: “obtain filtered data from a network location”; column 10, lines 52-67: “retrieving data...translating the data into XML...structured results as objects for use by other entities, such as modules”).

-In regard to dependent claims 7, and 18, Anuff teaches wherein the layout specification comprises determining the first layout style as a tabular layout (column 4, lines 6-14; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-64)(Fig. 5a & 5b).

-In regard to dependent claims 8 and 19, Anuff teaches wherein determining the layout comprises formatting the retrieved data for the first data source into the first specified layout style (column 2, lines 3-12; column 4, lines 6-14; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-64)(Fig. 5a & 5b).

-In regard to dependent claims 9, 21, and 28, Anuff teaches wherein the portal page comprises a web-based page (column 3, lines 44-47: “HTML web page”)(Fig. 2).

-In regard to dependent claims 10, 22, and 29, Anuff teaches wherein the portal page comprises a non web-based page containing object portlets (column 1, lines 26-39; column 3, lines 1-24 & 44-47: “modules containing the resources”)(Fig. 2).

-In regard to dependent claim 17, Anuff teaches wherein the layout interface comprises forwarding information that enables the display of one or more layout options and that enables the user to declaratively specify a layout type (column 2, lines 3-12; column 4, lines 6-14; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-64)(Fig. 5a & 5b).

-In regard to dependent claims 5, 15, and 26, Anuff teaches wherein the user can customize the portal to access a particular type of resource on a network (column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-5). Anuff also teaches wherein the user selected accessed resource could be external web sites (column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 52-67). Anuff does not specifically teach wherein the access the path to these resources comprises a URL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the access of said web sites to have included utilizing the sites URL's, because it was notoriously well known at the time of the invention that URL's provided the benefit of accessing resources on the Internet.

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al (US-6,327,628 12/04/01) in view of Bales et al (US-2004/0010598 01/15/04) in further view of Maslov (US-6,538,673 03/25/03).

-In regard to dependent claim 20, Anuff teaches wherein the user can customize the portal to access a particular type of resource on a network (column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-5). Anuff also teaches wherein the user selected accessed resource could be external web sites (column 7, lines 5-25; column 10, lines 52-67). Anuff does not specifically teach wherein the data source interface does not include the access information for the data source before it was

declaratively specified by the user. Maslov teaches wherein the data source interface includes the access information (i.e. URL) for the data source only after it was declaratively specified by the user (column 5, lines 43-45 & 63-67; column 8, lines 56-62: "includes URL address"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the data source interface to have not included the access information before the user specified the data source, because Maslov teaches that it was notoriously well known in the art that before the interface could know the access information the user must have browsed to the data source first (column 5, lines 43-45 & 63-67; column 8, lines 56-62: "includes URL address"). Maslov taught that this provided the benefit of only showing/storing the access information of specific user designated data sources (column 5, lines 43-45 & 63-67; column 6, lines 15-19; column 8, lines 56-62: "includes URL address").

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 07/27/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant argues that neither Anuff, Bales, nor Maslov alone or in combination teach or suggest the newly added features of, "forwarding information, from a first computer system to a second computer system, that configures the second computer system to display one or more graphical user interfaces that enable user of the second computer system to interactively construct software code representing portlets configured to generate information displays when included on the portal page." The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Anuff clearly teaches wherein a portal server provides a user interacting

with a client computer, a plurality of user interfaces for both customizing and defining portlet content, layout, and functionality. Whatever selections are made by the user at that client computer are dynamically utilized to define the HTML code for generating/displaying the defined portlet in the displayed portal page. The Examiner notes that to what extent the software coding “represents” the portlet is not clearly defined in the claims. To that point, the Examiner notes that the Bales reference has been relied upon to more particularly highlight the automatic generation of portlet coding based on user selections via a plurality of graphical user interfaces. In this instance all the code for reproducing the user customized portlet is automatically generating based on the user’s interactive session. Thus the combination of Anuff and Bales are believed to clearly meet the limitation of “interactively construct software code representing portlets.”

Applicant further argues that neither Anuff nor Bales specifically teach wherein a second user interface was provided to the second computer system from the first computer system for selecting layout information of at least on style. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. The client side user of Anuff can clearly define through the user interfaces provided by the server a plurality of layout options for a given portlet. For each portlet a user chooses to interact with, the user can revise the layout location of the portlet within a given portal page, edit the order and included content of the data information within a given portlet, as well as applying an overall style (“provide a different look-and-feel for different portions of the page and for different user groups”) for a portlet within a given portal page. These user selections in turn modify the code necessary to for displaying the modified portlet in a portal page. While not

relied upon, the Examiner additionally notes that the Bales reference also teaches determining the layout of a portlet via one of a plurality of user interfaces presented to a user.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178